UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,052	03/31/2004	Jesper Kiehn	M61.12-0615	7946

			EXAMINER
27366	7590	05/19/2005	HOFFMAN, BRANDON S

MICROSOFT CORPORATION C/O WESTMAN
CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.
SUITE 1400 - INTERNATIONAL CENTRE
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/815,052		KIEHN ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Brandon S. Hoffman		2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **3** MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 April 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-18,20-34 and 36-39* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-18,20-34 and 36-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3-22-05*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1, 3-18, 20-34, and 36-39 are pending in this office action, claims 2, 19,

and 35 are canceled.

2.   Applicant's arguments, filed April 14, 2005, have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.

Rejections

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   <u>Claims 1, 3-18, 20-34, and 36-39</u> are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over <u>Boozer et al.</u> (U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0205355 A1) in view of <u>Colburn</u>

<u>et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,404).

        Regarding <u>claims 1, 18, and 34</u>, <u>Boozer et al.</u> teaches a

method/system/computer readable medium for providing Resource-Event-Agent (REA)

model based security, the method/system/computer readable medium comprising:

- Identifying an association between a first object and a second object in an REA

    model (page 1, paragraph 0016);

- Creating an association class for the association between the first object and second object, the association class defining security between the first object and the second object (page 1, paragraph 0018).

Boozer et al. does not teach wherein creating the association class **object** for the association between the first object and the second object further comprises creating an association class **object having properties** defining security between the first object and the second object.

Colburn et al. teaches wherein creating the association class **object** for the association between the first object and the second object further comprises creating an association class **object having properties** defining security between the first object and the second object (col. 6, lines 42-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine creating an association class object having properties, the properties of the association class object defining the security between the first object and the second object, as taught by Colburn et al., with the method/system/ computer readable medium of Boozer et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because objects have properties that define the attributes of the object. The attributes define the object and therefore define the security between the two objects.

Regarding <u>claims 3, 20, and 36</u>, the combination of <u>Boozer et al.</u> in view of

<u>Colburn et al.</u> teaches wherein creating the association class object further comprises

creating one or more association class objects having properties, properties of the one

or more association class objects defining security between a first class of objects of

which the first object is a member and a second class of objects of which the second

object is a member (see col. 6, lines 42-52 of Colburn et al.).

Regarding <u>claim 4</u>, the combination of <u>Boozer et al.</u> in view of <u>Colburn et al.</u>

teaches wherein the second object is a securable object (see page 1, paragraph 0018

of Boozer et al., the objects may have security parents).

Regarding <u>claims 5 and 21</u>, the combination of <u>Boozer et al.</u> in view of <u>Colburn et

al.</u> teaches wherein the first object is of a particular agent type, and wherein a role for a

user is defined by the particular agent type for the first object (see page 6, paragraph

0066 and 0076 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding <u>claims 6-10 and 22-26</u>, official notice is taken that wherein the second

object is a contract or agreement type object, a commitment type object, an event type

object, a resource type object, and an agent type object is an obvious modification to

the method/system/computer readable medium of <u>Boozer et al.</u> in view of <u>Colburn et al.</u>

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the different object types that are specific to an REA model with the method/system/ computer readable medium of <u>Boozer et al.</u> in view of <u>Colburn et al.</u> because REA is just one of many modeling methods. Boozer et al. and Colburn et al. use different modeling methods, but mention different object types. The specific object types of the claim are particular of REA.

Regarding <u>claims 11, 12, 27, and 28</u>, the combination of <u>Boozer et al.</u> in view of <u>Colburn et al.</u> teaches wherein identifying the association between the first object and the second object further comprises identifying a [control type/custody type] association between the first object and the second object (see page 1, paragraph 0016 and page 3, paragraph 0033 of Boozer et al., control meaning 'ownership' and custody meaning 'template').

Regarding <u>claims 13 and 29</u>, the combination of <u>Boozer et al.</u> in view of <u>Colburn et al.</u> teaches wherein creating the association class **object** for the association between the first object and the second object further comprises creating the association class **object** in a security model (see page 1, paragraph 0016 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding <u>claims 14, 30, and 37</u>, the combination of <u>Boozer et al.</u> in view of <u>Colburn et al.</u> teaches wherein creating the association class **object** in the security

model further comprises creating the association class **object** in the security model

separate from the REA model (see fig. 19, ref. num 1200 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 15, 31, and 38, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of

Colburn et al. teaches wherein creating the association class **object** in the security

model further comprises creating the association class **object** in the security model as

part of the REA model (see fig. 2 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 16, 32, and 39, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of

Colburn et al. teaches wherein defining security between the first object and the second

object further comprises defining permissions and rights of the first object relative to the

second object (see page 2/3, paragraph 0029 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 17 and 33, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn

et al. teaches wherein defining permissions and rights of the first object relative to the

second object further comprises dynamically determining the permissions and rights in

a security policy logic module outside of the security model (see col. 5, line 65 through

col. 6, line 13 of Colburn et al.).

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant amends claims 1, 3, 4, 13-15, 18, 20, 21, 27-31, 34, and 36-39.

6.   Applicant argues Boozer et al. does not teach REA models or REA model based

security, therefore the claims cannot be taught (page 9, first paragraph).

Regarding applicant's argument, examiner disagrees with applicant. Firstly,

applicant amended the independent claims, which changes the scope, and therefore

alone merits a new ground of rejection. Second, in response to applicant's argument

that Boozer does not teach a REA model and REA model based security, a recitation of

the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between

the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed

invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the

intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the

intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See

In re Casey, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937,

939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Conclusion

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Brandon S. Hoffman whose telephone number is 571-

272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BH

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100